

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT**

In re Elijah V., et al., Persons Coming
Under the Juvenile Court Law.

A.E., et al.,
Petitioners and Respondents,
v.
E.V.,
Objector and Appellant.

F071829

(Fresno Super. Ct. Nos. 14CEFL00618 &
14CEFL00621)

OPINION

THE COURT*

APPEAL from orders of the Superior Court of Fresno County. D. Tyler Tharpe,
Judge.

Linda J. Conrad, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Objector and
Appellant.

No appearance for Petitioners and Respondents.

-ooOoo-

* Before Gomes, Acting P.J., Levy, J., and Kane, J.

Appellant E.V. (mother) appeals from an April 2015 order terminating her parental rights over her now 11-year-old son, Elijah, and nine-year-old daughter, Elaina. The order frees Elijah and Elaina to be adopted by their guardians (also their maternal grandparents) who had petitioned the court to terminate mother's parental rights pursuant to Probate Code section 1516.5.¹ Section 1516.5 authorizes termination of parental rights for children in probate guardianships when the guardianship has continued for at least two years and the court finds adoption by the guardian would benefit the child.

After reviewing the entire record, mother's court-appointed appellate counsel informed this court she could find no arguable issue to raise on mother's behalf. Counsel requested and this court granted leave for mother to personally file a letter setting forth a good cause showing that an arguable issue of reversible error does exist.

(In re Phoenix H. (2009) 47 Cal.4th 835, 844.)

Mother has since submitted a letter in which she explains that the guardianship was established at a "low point" in her life but claims that she subsequently improved her circumstances and attempted to regain custody of her children. Her efforts were thwarted, however, she contends, by ongoing interference by the children's guardians. Mother concludes by stating that, despite the interference, she tried to make the best of every situation and fought for custody at every hearing. She expresses her love for her children and her belief that she will always have a strong bond with them.

We conclude mother has not made a good cause showing that an arguable issue of reversible error exists.

PROCEDURAL AND FACTUAL SUMMARY

In 2003, mother married Michael, the father of Elijah and Elaina. In 2004, mother gave birth to Elijah. The following year, Michael was arrested for beating her. Mother left, took Elijah with her and then reconciled with Michael. She gave birth to Elaina in

¹ All statutory references are to the Probate Code.

2006. Later that year, Michael gave her a broken nose and two black eyes. He was arrested again for beating mother. Mother continued a pattern of leaving and returning to Michael over the ensuing years. In 2011, Michael beat mother and Elijah. Shortly after, mother was placed on an involuntary psychiatric hold and her parents were granted temporary guardianship over the children.

In September 2011, the superior court issued letters of guardianship to the maternal grandparents. The children thereafter remained in the care of their guardians. Mother, meanwhile, attempted unsuccessfully to terminate the guardianship.

In February 2014, the guardians filed a petition to terminate mother's parental rights under section 1516.5

In January 2015, the superior court convened a contested hearing on the petition. Prior to the hearing, the parties stipulated that the guardianship had been in place for the statutory period of time required by section 1516.5. At the conclusion of the hearing, in April 2015, the court found that the children would "benefit immensely" from being adopted by the guardians and granted the petitions.

DISCUSSION

An appealed-from judgment or order is presumed correct. (*Denham v. Superior Court* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 557, 564.) It is up to an appellant to raise claims of reversible error or other defect and present argument and authority on each point made. If an appellant does not do so, the appeal may be dismissed. (*In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952, 994.)

In this case, mother does not raise any claim of error. Rather, she informs this court of her efforts to regain custody of the children and expresses her love for them. In the absence of any "error or other defect claimed against the orders appealed from," this court has "no reason to proceed to the merits of any unraised 'points'--and, a fortiori, no reason to reverse or even modify the orders in question." (*In re Sade C., supra*, 13 Cal.4th 952, 994.) Thus, we conclude mother has not made a good cause showing that

an arguable issue of reversible error does exist and that dismissal is the appropriate action.

DISPOSITION

This appeal is dismissed.